

**IT Professional Technical Services
Master Contract Program
T#: 902TS**

**Statement of Work (SOW)
For Technology Services
Issued By**

Minnesota Department of Corrections

Project Title: Electronic Base File

**Service Category(ies): Project Management, Analyst –
Business, Web Applications Specialist - .NET/ASP**

Business Need

The Minnesota Department of Corrections (DOC) is responsible for the custody of all Minnesota adult male and female felony offenders committed to the Commissioner of Corrections. The department operates ten correctional facilities, including two for juveniles. The adult population totals more than 9,200 plus approximately 150 juvenile residents. Field service agents supervise about 20,000 individuals on probation, supervised release and parole. The Department provides statewide guidance and leadership in criminal justice programs and offender information sharing. The DOC Records Management Unit serves as the liaison between the DOC and courts, attorneys, law enforcement, and other criminal justice agencies. They are also typically responsible for managing information regarding admission, release and sentence administration of all offenders in the state.

When an offender is admitted into a correctional facility, a base file is created which becomes the place where designated papers related to the offender's incarceration are filed. This collection of paper documents plays an important role in an offender's progress through the correctional system where timely and accurate flow of offender information is relied upon both internally and by partner criminal justice agencies for case planning, treatment, classification and release and for general knowledge of the offender's incarceration adjustment and history.

Each of the ten Minnesota Correctional Facilities has a secure file room or records office where the base files of offenders are located. This facility central file room is where staff and others must go to check out offender base files to view paper documents regarding offenders. The base file is a physical folder averaging 350 pages with section dividers that represent broad categories of documents. Over Fifty percent of the document types in the base file are created internally. Retrieval of the paper records is inefficient. Individuals searching for a certain document must page through many documents in order to find the one they set out for. This process time consuming for both the person accessing the file and the file room staff.

As offenders transfer to other Minnesota Correctional Facilities the base file is also transported with the offender to the new facility by the custody staff. There are more than 7,000 transfers annually within the DOC. Once an offender is released the base file is transferred to a central location where over 14,000 are centrally maintained and manually retrieved and accessed over 125,000 times (figures from 2008).

The DOC Records unit is responsible for managing offender sentence administration, release planning, pending court matters and other offender information. The offender base file project will result in working document management solutions for the Records unit and the DOC. The initial solutions will address physical storage issues, business process issues and productivity issues related to the storage and retrieval of base file documents for a selected population of offenders. In addition, internal resources will develop the knowledge needed to continue implementing document management solutions for the offender base file after the contract is completed.

The Correctional Operations Management System (COMS) contains an electronic document component (COMS EDS) where some offender documents are scanned and stored electronically. EDS was designed with the same structure as the physical base file with several section dividers (folders) that represent broad categories in which papers are scanned and filed. Even though EDS is in electronic format, it is merely a storage application with no search capability or document metadata.

The following list contains deficiencies of the current DOC document management capabilities.

- Offender paper files are susceptible to loss, damage, or being accessed inappropriately. Paper documents have become missing, mislabeled or transferred to the wrong facility, taking weeks to locate. Emergency offender transfers often require that files travel separately and arrive late at facilities.
- There is insufficient physical storage space to manage tens of thousands of files processed annually.
- Search capabilities necessary for quick retrieval are lacking. This creates potential security risks and a diminishing the ability to respond to individual offender programming needs.
- Application of document security is limited or non-existent and there is no auditing capability.
- Retention and purging of critical documents is labor intensive, expensive and time consuming.

The opportunity exists to lay the foundation of a future electronic offender base file system that is designed to represent the DOC business needs for efficient electronic document storage, retrieval and security. This project is also an opportunity to examine business requirements and processes that lead to the creation of documents and eliminate those that have limited value to the mission.

The Department of Corrections has identified the need for document management that includes replacing paper documents and developing workflows to improve department efficiency related to the offender base file. In 2005 document management products were evaluated by DOC and OnBase was implemented for use by the DOC MINNCOR and RACN divisions and the Record unit for archiving records of discharged offenders. The DOC wishes to leverage the use of SharePoint and/or OnBase for the electronic base file project.

In order to achieve the most value from SharePoint and OnBase the agency requires the expertise of a knowledgeable vendor to assist with the evaluation and expansion to the offender base file. This statement of work covers the necessary tasks such as project management, analysis and evaluation, development, and knowledge transfer to internal staff for ongoing support.

This project supports the agency's value of strategic and efficient use of resources. The project will contribute to a safer Minnesota by enhancing the department's ability to provide core correctional care while holding offenders accountable.

Stakeholders include Department of Corrections staff, Courts, and partner criminal justice agencies.

The following limitations and constraints have been identified for this project:

- 1) Consultant resources are funded by a grant from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). These resources must complete their work by 06/30/2011.
- 2) The ARRA grant requires a strict schedule for reporting project status and metrics. This will need to be accounted for in the project plan.
- 3) The budget, timeline, and resources are fixed; therefore, scope management is our main opportunity for flexibility.

The project will focus on the base files of a select pilot group of offenders (TBD) as a proof of concept and expanded to all offenders if time permits.

An electronic base file will increase department efficiencies by allowing the real time exchange of information concerning the intake, expediting the entry of sentences, processing, and release planning of offenders. The timely exchange of information increases the ability of the department to manage the short-term and long-term capacity management and planning for the safe and efficient processing of offenders into and out of the correctional system.

Project Deliverables

The resulting solutions will address document storage and retrieval, electronic forms and workflow including electronic authorization and audit functions. It will enable the DOC to exchange offender base file information quickly and accurately—both internally and with partner criminal justice agencies. Documents will be available to multiple users at multiple locations within the DOC; provide faster access and retrieval through built in search capability using document metadata; provide document security and access control; provide disaster recovery; provide for future automation and documentation needs; provide automated document retention and archiving. Through the business analysis the DOC could decide to eliminate some documents because of limited value to the organization.

- Specific deliverables required:
Detailed project plan that will describe other milestones and project deliverables.
Identification of equipment needs, if any.
Identification of electronic storage requirements.
Creation of work flows that replace manual processes for internal documents.
Review of a scanning system for documents received from external sources.
Knowledge transfer and documentation so that DOC can expand EBF after the contract is completed.

Project Milestones and Schedule

Other key milestones will be determined by the detailed project plan. The SOW end date is September 30, 2011.

Activity	Estimated Finish (by calendar year)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Steering Committee appointed. • Project Charter created and approved by Project Steering Committee. • Business Case document created. • Statement of work and certification form created and filed with OET for review and approval. 	Quarter 1 1/1/2010 – 3/31/2010
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Team identified • Project Manager (PM) hired and finalizes detailed project plan. • PM and business users finalize decisions regarding identification of "document types", retrieval "keywords", and security (who, where, access rights) • Current records scanning process is reviewed. • Determine additional consulting resources needed to move forward with the project and begin the hiring process. (Business Analyst (BA) and SharePoint/OnBase Developer.) 	Quarter 2 4/1/10 - 6/30/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PM, BA and business users make final decisions regarding equipment, processes for scanning/indexing, prepping for scanning, retention of paper originals, required electronic routing workflow. • PM, BA and business users document, review, and approve initial prioritized group of document processes (e.g. warrant of commit, court/agency correspondence, release plans, reviews, etc.) • DOC identifies and hires SharePoint/OnBase developer. 	Quarter 3 7/1/10 - 9/30/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SharePoint/OnBase developer starts and implements approved document processes • PM, BA and business users document, review, and approve next prioritized group of document processes. 	Quarter 4 10/1/10 - 12/31/10
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SharePoint/OnBase developer implements next group of approved document processes • PM, BA and business users document, review, and approve next prioritized 	Quarter 5 1/1/11 - 3/31/11

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> group of document processes. PM, BA and business users finalize decisions regarding user training, equipment maintenance and support plans. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SharePoint/OnBase developer implements next group of approved document processes. PM, BA and business users document, review, and approve next prioritized group of document processes. User training materials are developed. 	Quarter 6 4/1/11 - 6/30/11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SharePoint/OnBase developer implements next group of approved document processes. Users are trained and rollout of new process occurs. Follow-up user survey is developed. PM, BA, and business users develop plan for future expansion of this effort to automate existing paper processes. Project completes. 	Quarter 7 7/1/11 - 9/30/11

Project Environment (State Resources)

The agency IT unit consists of three sections: Application Development, Facility Support and Technical Support. Facility Support includes IT (help desk) support by staff in prison facilities. Technical Support includes Operations, Level 1 and 2 technical support, network architecture and support, security and Business Continuity.

The agency will have one application architect and one business analyst staff working on the project at 12% capacity. These DOC staff report to the Application Development Manager, who has committed their time for this project. Consultants will report to the Facility Support Manager in their duties related to this project.

The agency has one primary custom application where integration decisions will have to be made. The Correctional Operations Management System (COMS) is a Microsoft VB/.NET application that is used to manage DOC inmate information. The Agency is licensed for Microsoft Office SharePoint Services (MOSS) 2007 and is planning to upgrade to SharePoint 2010 soon after it is made available to take advantage of the additional features. The agency uses OnBase for archiving records and other smaller business purposes. The agency would look for the vendor to provide integration recommendations as needed.

The agency uses Novell for file/print services, and identity management but is transitioning to Microsoft and Active Directory. DOC will make available a SharePoint and /or OnBase test environment for this project if needed.

Agency Project Requirements

While most DOC systems run from a central location, most users reside in one of 10 prison facilities maintained by the agency. Some training of agency technical staff may be necessary. Development work must conform to state and agency standards, which will be provided by agency IT staff. Agency applications conform to the Statewide Enterprise Architecture using statewide project management guidelines as well as agency application development standards. Hardware and software needs will be determined as part of the analysis and evaluation tasks. The agency wishes to leverage its investment in SharePoint and OnBase.

Responsibilities Expected of the Selected Vendor

The vendor will be expected to provide staffing as necessary for project management, all aspects of application development, database analysis and design, business process design, change management and documentation. The vendor will provide a detailed project plan in the first quarter of the project. Specific skill categories are listed below. Vendor staff will be expected to make recommendations for IT technology decisions as requested. Vendor staff will also be expected to provide knowledge transfer to agency staff so that agency staff can assume responsibility for ongoing support. In addition, vendor staff will

be expected to assist internal quality control staff with application testing based on internally developed test plans.

Required Skills (These are to be scored as pass/fail requirements)

Required minimum qualifications:

- Three years experience in project management, business analysis and web application (.NET) in projects of a similar nature (electronic documents, workflow, document storage and retrieval, document security and auditing).
- Two years proven experience with SharePoint (MOSS) 2007 specifically related to content management and business process sufficient to evaluate and create complicated workflows related to documents.
- Three years proven experience with OnBase document management software sufficient to evaluate and create complicated workflows related to documents.
- Two years business process design experience.

Desired Skills

- Working knowledge of SharePoint 2010.
- Experience with document scanning process hardware and software.

Process Schedule

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| • Deadline for Questions | 04/12/2010, 2:30 pm, CDT |
| • Posted Response to Questions | 04/14/2010, 2:30 pm, CDT |
| • Proposals due | 04/20/2010, 2:30 pm, CDT |
| • Anticipated proposal evaluation begins | 04/22/2010, 2:30 pm, CDT |
| • Anticipated proposal evaluation & decision | 04/29/2010, 2:30 pm, CDT |

Questions

Any questions regarding this Statement of Work should be submitted via mail or e-mail by March 31, 2010, 2:30 pm, Central Daylight Time to:

Mike Kriegler
Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108
E-mail: mike.kriegler@state.mn.us

Other personnel are not authorized to answer questions regarding this Statement of Work. **Questions submitted via e-mail should be titled “EBF SOW Question” in the subject line and will be considered to be received at the date and time indicated on the DOC e-mail header.** All questions submitted must contain the name, company, address and e-mail address of the person submitting the question.

It is anticipated that all questions and answers will be posted on the Office of Enterprise Technology website by the end of the day, April 14, 2010.

SOW Evaluation Process

All responses must be received (e-mail, mail, or delivery) by the due date and time and will be evaluated according to the evaluation process detailed below. Information on the content, format and submittal requirements is provided in the next section.

Step 1: Pass/Fail Criteria. Review responses to ensure proposals are delivered in a timely manner and pass/fail criteria are met before further evaluation is completed.

Step 2: All proposals that meet the requirements of Step 1 will be evaluated on “best value” 60% qualifications, 30% cost considerations, and 10% extent to which services will be performed in the United States. The evaluation committee will not review the cost proposal until after the qualification points are awarded. A 1000-point scale will be used to create the evaluation recommendation. The factors and weighting upon which the proposal will be evaluated are as follows:

- Experience and knowledge of proposed project staff (project management) **30%**
- Desired skills (SharePoint, OnBase knowledge, etc.) **15%**
- Work Plan **10%**
- Three References **5%**
- Cost **30%**
- Extent to which services will be performed within the U.S. or by a WTO country company within its own borders 10%

Step 3: Interviews. Responses reviewed by the EBF Selection Committee will be scored as part of Step 2 and the top-scoring vendor(s) (up to three) will be interviewed by the selection committee as part of the final selection process.

The State reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals and to negotiate the terms of the Contract Work Order, including the Cost Proposal, with the selected responder prior to entering into a Contract Work Order. Should the State be unable to negotiate a Contract Work Order with the Responder of first choice, the State reserves the right to negotiate with the Responder of second choice, etc. The State reserves the right to request a best and final offer if the evaluation team deems it necessary.

Background checks will be performed on the chosen Responder staff involved in this project prior to the start of any work under the Contract Work Order.

Response Requirements

The items below must be completely satisfied in the submission in order for the Response to be considered. At any time during the evaluation steps the State may, at the State's discretion, contact a Vendor to provide further or missing information or clarification on their Response. However, there is no guarantee that the State will look for information or clarification outside of the submitted written Response. Therefore, it is important that the Vendor ensure that their Response is complete and all requirements have been completely met in order to avoid the possibility of failing an evaluation step or having their score reduced for lack of information.

The Vendor must be eligible for the OET service category(ies) indicated in this Statement of Work, under its 902TS IT Professional/Technical Services Master Contract with the Office of Enterprise Technology, before the response deadline.

Responses must include the following:

- **Introduction** identifying respondent and respondent's representative during the procurement process (contact information)
- **Conflict of interest statement** as it relates to this project
- **Company overview**
 - a) Company history, growth
 - b) Current financial data if publicly available
- **Project Work Plan** – should at a minimum:
 - a) Demonstrate the Vendor's understanding of the services requested in the Statement of Work and any problems anticipated in accomplishing the work.
 - b) Show the overall design idea/plan for achieving the results defined in the Statement of Work.
 - c) Explain how the Vendor will meet the requirements established in the Statement of Work and/or necessary to implement their design idea/plan.
 - d) Explain if Vendor's solution already includes the business/project requirements identified or whether the scope/timing will need to be modified. If possible describe each modification or conversion necessary.

- e) Include a description of software/hardware configuration.
- f) Detail a Project Approach, explaining how the Vendor will approach their participation in the project, including:
 - 1) Organization and staffing (see staff qualifications below)
 - 2) Contract/change management procedures
 - 3) Project management (e.g. quality management, risk assessment/management, etc.)
 - 4) Documentation of progress such as status reports

- **Staff Qualifications** – The Response must specifically indicate how the Vendor's proposed staff meet or exceed all the Required Qualifications and any of the Desired Qualifications. In addition, include a resume for each staff member.

- **Cost** – detailed cost proposal, including the following:

- a) Total project cost- all inclusive
- b) Cost per deliverable (should correspond with deliverables identified in this Statement of Work and Vendor's Response Work Plan).
- c) Hourly rate and total estimated hours for each staff member you intend to assign to the project. Hourly rates cannot exceed the hourly rate identified in your 902TS master contract for the OET service category indicated in this Statement of Work and/or Work Plan categories identified as part of Vendor Response).

- **References** – provide three clients references (preferably clients using this type of solution)

- **Required forms** to be returned or additional provisions that must be included in proposal

- a) Affirmative Action Certificate of Compliance (if over \$100,000)
<http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/doc/affaction.doc>
- b) Affidavit of non-collusion
<http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/doc/noncollusion.doc>
- c) Immigration Status Certification (if over \$50,000)
<http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/doc/immstatcert.doc>
- d) Location of Service Disclosure
<http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/Doc/ForeignOutsourcingDisclosureCertification.doc>
- e) Certification Regarding Lobbying
<http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/doc/lobbying.doc>

Proposal Submission Instructions

Responses to this request must be submitted to:

Mike Kriegler
Department of Corrections, IT
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108

Proposals are due by 2:30 pm, Central Daylight Time, April 20, 2010. Late proposals will not be accepted.

Responses should be mailed or delivered to the above address. Please submit three (3) copies of the proposal and one (1) separately-sealed copy of the cost proposal labeled to the attention of the EBF Selection Committee. It is the Vendor's sole responsibility to ensure that their submittal is received by the response deadline.

General Requirements

Proposal Contents

By submission of a proposal, Responder warrants that the information provided is true, correct and reliable for purposes of evaluation for potential award of this work order. The submission of inaccurate or misleading information may be grounds for disqualification from the award as well as subject the responder to suspension or debarment proceedings as well as other remedies available by law.

Liability

The Contractor must indemnify, save, and hold the State, its agents, and employees harmless from any claims or causes of action, including attorney's fees incurred by the State, arising from the performance of this contract by the Contractor or the Contractor's agents or employees. This clause will not be construed to bar any legal remedies the Contractor may have for the State's failure to fulfill its obligations under this contract.

Disposition of Responses

All materials submitted in response to this SOW will become property of the State and will become public record in accordance with Minnesota Statutes, section 13.591, after the evaluation process is completed. Pursuant to the statute, completion of the evaluation process occurs when the government entity has completed negotiating the contract with the selected vendor. If the Responder submits information in response to this SOW that it believes to be trade secret materials, as defined by the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act, Minn. Stat. § 13.37, the Responder must: clearly mark all trade secret materials in its response at the time the response is submitted, include a statement with its response justifying the trade secret designation for each item, and defend any action seeking release of the materials it believes to be trade secret, and indemnify and hold harmless the State, its agents and employees, from any judgments or damages awarded against the State in favor of the party requesting the materials, and any and all costs connected with that defense. This indemnification survives the State's award of a contract. In submitting a response to this RFP, the Responder agrees that this indemnification survives as long as the trade secret materials are in possession of the State.

The State will not consider the prices submitted by the Responder to be proprietary or trade secret materials.

Conflicts of Interest

Responder must provide a list of all entities with which it has relationships that create, or appear to create, a conflict of interest with the work that is contemplated in this request for proposals. The list should indicate the name of the entity, the relationship, and a discussion of the conflict.

The responder warrants that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, and except as otherwise disclosed, there are no relevant facts or circumstances which could give rise to organizational conflicts of interest. An organizational conflict of interest exists when, because of existing or planned activities or because of relationships with other persons, a vendor is unable or potentially unable to render impartial assistance or advice to the State, or the vendor's objectivity in performing the contract work is or might be otherwise impaired, or the vendor has an unfair competitive advantage. The responder agrees that, if after award, an organizational conflict of interest is discovered, an immediate and full disclosure in writing must be made to the Assistant Director of the Department of Administration's Materials Management Division ("MMD") which must include a description of the action which the contractor has taken or proposes to take to avoid or mitigate such conflicts. If an organization conflict of interest is determined to exist, the State may, at its discretion, cancel the contract. In the event the responder was aware of an organizational conflict of interest prior to the award of the contract and did not disclose the conflict to MMD, the State may terminate the contract for default. The provisions of this clause must be included in all subcontracts for work to be performed similar to the service provided by the prime contractor, and the terms "contract," "contractor," and "contracting officer" modified appropriately to preserve the State's rights.